

There are many, certainly, in Washington, DC, who think the prescription drug issue is too complicated and too political to deal with now, that we should wait until after the election. Senator SNOWE and I reject that approach. It is more than a year until the next election. We are hoping senior citizens, just as this poster next to me says, will send in copies of their prescription drug bills to their Senators. Tell the Members of the Senate exactly why this issue is important to them, why the lack of prescription drug coverage is causing them a hardship, and help Senator SNOWE and I ignite a grassroots movement to ensure that prescription drug coverage does become part of the Medicare program.

In effect, it is time for a wake-up call to the Congress. Some of the naysayers and those who say we ought to put this issue off I think are missing the real needs of the Nation's older people. If you have an income of \$15,000 or \$16,000 and you are spending \$1,500 a year for prescription drugs, if you are giving up other essentials, such as electricity, to pay for your prescription drugs, you cannot afford to wait until after the next election.

It may be a luxury for people here in the beltway to wait until after the next election to talk about the need to come up with a practical solution to covering older people with their prescriptions. Senator SNOWE and I think waiting is not a luxury that the millions of vulnerable, older people in this country have. They cannot afford to wait.

We are hoping, as a result of this campaign we have launched in the last week to have folks send in a copy of their prescription drug bills, that this can serve as a wakeup call to this Senate and this Congress that the time to act is now.

We hope the Senate will choose the proposal we have developed. Undoubtedly, there are other very good ideas. I am sure we will hear from seniors, when they send in copies of their bills, about the best way to address this issue legislatively. Ours is a marketplace-oriented approach. It is based on the kind of program that Members of the Senate have.

We hope, in the days ahead, seniors from across the country will send us copies of their prescription drug bills. We want to see this coverage added now. We want to see the Senate address this in a bipartisan way.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent the time be evenly charged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, to my amazement, we received a letter indicating the President might want to veto the foreign operations appropriations bill, a stunning development, it seems to me, almost inexplicable.

This bill, while not as much as the President requested, is as large as he signed last year and includes a number of items important not only to many of us but to him as well.

For example, if this bill were to ultimately be vetoed, the President would be vetoing—would be stopping—aid to the Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union of \$735 million; developmental assistance, which was \$83 million over his request in this bill that he is threatening to veto; narcotics assistance at \$285 million, which is \$24 million above last year, the bill that he signed; for AIDS, \$180 million to fight AIDS, which is \$55 million above the bill that he signed last year; for UNICEF, an important program of the United Nations, there is \$110 million in this bill for UNICEF, which is \$5 million more than in the bill last year that he signed.

Obviously, we continue the Middle East earmarks to Israel and Egypt. Vetoing this bill would deny \$3 billion to Israel. I think it is important to note that The American Israel Public Affairs Committee supports this bill. AIPAC supports this bill. I ask unanimous consent that letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIPAC,

*Washington, DC, October 6, 1999.*

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCONNELL: We are writing to express our support for the Conference Report on HR 2606, the FY 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, which contains funding for Israel's regular aid package, including provisions for early disbursement, offshore procurement and refugee resettlement. The Middle East peace process is moving forward with both Israel and the Palestinians committed to resolving issues between them within a year. It is important that Congress support Israel as this process moves ahead, and we therefore also hope and urge that Congress find a way to fund assistance to the Wye River signatories before the end of this year.

Sincerely,

LIONEL KAPLAN,  
President.  
HOWARD KOHR,  
Executive Director.  
BRAD GORDON,  
Legislative Director.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, other items in this bill of interest: Child health, immunization, and education initiatives. For Kosovo—we fought a war there a few months ago—there is \$535 million for Kosovo and for

some of the countries surrounding Kosovo that were impacted by the war that was fought there. That is \$142 million more than the President requested.

In addition, there is money in this bill for the environment, for biodiversity, for tropical rain forests, unique ecosystems initiatives. All of that will be denied if the President vetoes this bill.

For Lebanon and Cyprus, to help in the reconciliation process there, there is \$15 million for Lebanon and \$15 million for Cyprus.

Infectious diseases, especially polio and TB campaigns, which have been priorities of Senator LEAHY, all of that would be vetoed by this bill.

Funds for Georgia, for Ukraine, for Armenia, for Poland—all of which is supported vigorously by Americans of Georgian, Ukrainian, Armenian, and Polish descent—all of that would not go forward if this bill were vetoed. The vote on this bill, when it went through the Senate—and it is not all that different now from the way it was when it cleared the Senate—was 97-2. This is virtually the same bill, at \$12.6 billion, which protects virtually all of the Senate priorities passed here at 97-2. On the threat reduction initiative, we have spent \$5.9 billion in Russia over the years. There are no restrictions on the \$735 million we provide for that area of the world preventing funding of this new \$250 million initiative to control the nuclear problem there.

On development assistance, the President claims it is dramatically underfunded. In fact, we not only exceeded last year's level—that is the bill President Clinton signed—we exceeded last year's level of spending and we have exceeded his request for this year. The President requested \$83 million less than the conference has provided.

The veto threat to the Senator from Kentucky is inexplicable. It doesn't make any sense, unless this important bill for the assistance of Israel and Egypt and Armenia and Georgia and Ukraine and a number of other worthwhile causes that are supported around the world is somehow being made part of a larger strategy by the administration to veto all of these bills.

This bill enjoys strong support from AIPAC, from Armenian Americans, from Georgian Americans, Polish Americans, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, and Ukrainian Americans. They are but a few of the Americans who appreciate this bill.

As I indicated, all of these items are threatened by the President's inexplicable decision to threaten to veto this bill.

Finally, let me say, before turning to my friend and colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, I don't know where the President wants to get more money for this bill. Are we going to take it out of the Social Security trust fund to spend on foreign aid? Is that what the President is suggesting we do? Does President Clinton want us to take money

out of the Social Security trust fund and spend it on foreign aid? I don't think that is something we ought to be doing. I don't think the American people would like that.

I repeat, this is a bill that was supported overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis when it cleared the Senate the first time. It is about the same size as the bill the President signed last year.

I don't think there is any rational basis for the vetoing of this bill. I encourage the Senate to speak once again on a broad bipartisan basis with a large vote to support this important bill which means so much to peace and stability around the world.

With that, Mr. President, I understand we are planning on voting around noon. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, how much time is available to this side of the aisle?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 14 minutes 50 seconds remaining, and the Senator from Kentucky has 17 minutes 24 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, had spoken earlier as in morning business; is that correct, and that was taken from my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The UC took the time from this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the time taken by Mr. WYDEN be restored to my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair. We may well not use it. I am trying to protect time for some who may want to come and speak.

It has been a week since the conference committee on foreign operations completed its work. The House tried, during that week, to muscle the votes to pass it, and yesterday they did, by a three-vote margin.

As stated by some of the leadership in the House, the bill is part of a grand Republican strategy to force the President to either except a large cut in funding for foreign policy or veto the bill and then be blamed for cutting Social Security to pay for foreign policy, even though everybody knows that is not going to happen. I think the American people are more savvy than that. They know that foreign policy is the key responsibility of the Federal Government. It has been ever since the days of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin.

Today the world is far more complex, more dangerous, more independent than anybody could have assumed. They also know the President is not going to do anything to harm Social Security.

The House finally passed the conference report by three votes. The bill will pass here, with a third of the Sen-

ate voting against it. Then the President vetoes it. It is unfortunate we are here.

In that regard, let me say something about the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. I should warn him and alert him that I am going to praise him. That may bring about the Republican State committee initiating in Kentucky a recall petition, but that is the price of fame and glory.

The fact is, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky took an allocation, as chairman of this subcommittee, which by anybody's standards—his, mine or anybody else's—was too small. With that, he tried to fashion a bill that reflects the best interests of our country and the needs of our country and the great humanitarian nature of Americans.

He has done it extraordinarily well. He has bent over backward—I say this to all Democratic Members of the Senate as well as Republican Members—to accommodate the needs of Senators on both sides of the aisle. His chief of foreign policy, Robin Cleveland, and others have worked very closely with Senators on both sides of the aisle to try to accommodate all they could. Are there things not in here? Of course. You only have so much money.

There are things the Senator from Kentucky would like to increase in here, substantially. Without embarrassing him, I won't go down the list, but he could think of a number of areas. Are there things the Senator from Vermont would want to see increased? Of course, there are, substantial areas.

We have seen, for example, the situation we now have in New York City where, after an outbreak of encephalitis, there is now a feeling that this disease came over transported by a bird. It is now infecting birds and humans in New York. As birds migrate south, it will affect others. Where did the disease come from? A different continent. It demonstrates that every disease is only an airplane trip away.

We have money in here to approach that problem, working with a number of people, Dr. Nils Daulaire and others, to try to help countries identify diseases when they occur in their country, help them eradicate them there, help them contain them—both for the humanitarian effort of helping this country get rid of the disease, but also one that protects all the rest of the world so the disease doesn't spread. Could we use a lot more money? Yes, we could. Ironically, we will end up spending hundreds of times more in this country, if we don't do this, just to help protect our own people within our own borders, than the fraction of that amount we would spend to stop the disease from occurring in the first place. That is one example. AIDS, the greatest calamity to hit the world since World War II, does not have ample funds.

It has extra money in here. I complimented him and the distinguished

Senator from Kentucky for helping get that money in. Both of us believe and both of us have said repeatedly that the money in here falls short of what is needed to protect our interests around the world.

For years, we urged the administration to fight harder for the foreign operations budget. Let me say this as a criticism of the administration of my own party: Too often, the administration has done too little, too late to build the support in Congress.

At the same time, the Congress has failed to allocate to our subcommittee the funds we need. This bill is \$800 million below the 1999 level and \$1.9 billion below the President's request, which, frankly, was not an unreasonable request. It is substantially less than this Congress was willing to give President Ronald Reagan for foreign aid. At a time when President Reagan was expressing concerns about foreign aid, he was still spending far more than we have in here, in a world much smaller than it is today.

It may surprise Senators to know that the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request for foreign operations, which he didn't get, is about the same as the amount we appropriated a decade ago. It is far less if you count inflation and far, far less if you count the amount we actually came up with.

We have a lot of interests around the globe. The United States, a nation of a quarter of a billion people, has the pre-eminent economy and military might in the world. But our economy and military might, by itself, does not protect our interests totally and does not enable us to continue our interests into the next century.

It is absurd that at the threshold of the 21st century, we continue to nickel and dime our foreign policy spending. We spend less than 1 percent of the Federal budget on foreign policy. Yet we are a worldwide power. Companies in my little State of Vermont are involved in international trade. We are, on a per capita basis, about third or fourth in the country in exporting outside our borders. With the Internet, any company in Vermont, or Kentucky, or Arkansas, or Illinois, or anywhere else, which does business on the Internet, if they are selling something, they are going to get inquiries from Sri Lanka, from Japan, from Germany, from the Middle East. We are a worldwide, interconnected economy.

We are also a nation that is called upon almost as a 911 source to help put out regional battles, fights, and so on, where democracy has not taken hold, and we will spend tens of billions, even hundreds of billions, of dollars to do that. But we won't spend a tiny fraction of that amount of money in our foreign policy budget to try to help democracy take place in the first place, so we don't have to call out the marines.

Unfortunately, the majority in Congress refuses to face up to that. We continue to underfund these programs

and to underfund our diplomacy in the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill.

It is an isolationist, shortsighted approach that weakens our security, puts undue burdens on our Armed Forces, and does damage to future generations of Americans. We still have Members of Congress who call this foreign aid, and they even brag about cutting foreign aid. These are the same Members of Congress who say, "I will never leave the shores of this Nation while I serve in Congress," as though this Nation exists just within its shores—a nation where every one of our Fortune 500 companies do business around the world, every one of our States' economies is greatly affected by what kind of business we do around the world. Our students travel abroad; our citizens travel abroad. I don't know how many times we have people going to other countries saying, "I am an American, I must have some rights." What do we do to help support those rights?

To say we don't need to be involved in foreign aid, especially when the United States spends far less of its budget than most other nations—actually less in dollars than some—is simplistic, self-serving, and mostly inaccurate. These programs benefit all Americans.

We have a number of programs that are underfunded in this budget that create jobs in the United States. We create the greatest number of jobs in our economy in those jobs that affect our exports. To the extent that our foreign aid and foreign policy programs improve the economies of other countries, they improve our markets. But unlike the request the President has made for funding to support America's export community, the bill cuts those funds.

The President has requested funding to support national security programs, including to safeguard nuclear material in the former Soviet Union. If you want something to make you wake up at 3 o'clock in the morning, think of the inadequate controls over the nuclear material that is now stored in the former Soviet Union. Ask any American, "Would you support something that would help us secure those nuclear materials?" and they will say yes. This bill cuts those funds.

The President has asked for funds to build free markets, to strengthen democratic governments that support our policies, to protect the global environment. I don't think anybody opposes these programs, but we are just not going to pay for them. Rather than funding them at a level commensurate with the requirements and needs of a superpower with the world's largest economy, some want to make political points. I disagree with that. I think that is dangerous.

I voted to report the bill from the committee. I did that mostly out of respect for the efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee. I voted for it on the floor, as most Senators did, to send it

to conference. But I said at that time my vote was contingent upon additional funding being added in conference. It did not happen.

I don't support everything the President has asked for at all. I want to make that clear. Some things I would vote against. But there is much in this conference report I do support. I don't support a cut in funding. I think the long-term security costs to our economy and our security will be far greater. It is simply irresponsible.

Year after year, I have voted for foreign operations bills I thought were too low. I thought last year's bill was too low, and I said so at the time. I voted for it because I thought it was the best we could do and it would not do irreparable harm to our national security. But this bill is \$800 million less than last year's.

We have written a balanced bill. I have talked about the provisions I support, such as funding to combat HIV/AIDS in Africa and other development assistance programs. It also includes some provisions I don't support, but we had a fair debate and vote on them. That is fine with me.

Funding for IDA, which makes low-cost loans to the poorest countries, was cut by \$175 million. Funding for the U.N. agencies was cut. Funding for the Korea Energy program cut by \$20 million. Funding for peacekeeping was cut. Funding for nonproliferation, antiterrorism, and other security programs was cut. The Peace Corps was cut.

The world's population is going to pass 6 billion people next week, yet this conference report provides \$50 million less for international family planning than the amount passed by the Senate in July and \$100 million less than we spent 10 years ago, when the population was much smaller.

It cuts funding for the Global Environment Facility by \$157 million below last year's level and \$108 million below the President's request.

I want to see a bill the President can sign. I say this to the administration and the leadership of the House and Senate: You have many Members on both sides of the aisle who want a good bill. But all of you are going to have to help us get the money so we can have a better bill.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I will be voting against the fiscal year 2000 Foreign Operations appropriations bill conference report. Although I supported this bill when it came through the Senate, I was hopeful that during the conference we would find the resources to address the serious deficiencies in this bill. Unfortunately, that was not the case and we have before us a bill that dramatically cuts the Administration's request for foreign operations by 14 percent.

At a time of great uncertainty around the world, when we are being called on to foster new democracies, support peacekeeping operations, prevent the spread of nuclear weapons,

and provide critical support for the ongoing Middle East peace process, we have before us a bill which threatens to undermine many of these vital foreign policy interests. If we nickel and dime our foreign policy priorities now, we will pay a higher price down the road when we respond to the ensuing international crises.

I have generally supported our foreign aid budget. It is a less than one percent of our annual budget, a small amount to protect our national interests and provide tremendous benefit to those in need. In the past, however, when our spending contributed to burgeoning deficits, I opposed foreign aid or for that matter any spending bill that surpassed the spending levels of the previous year. However, in this era of budget surpluses the debate has shifted to a question of priorities. And, it is in this context that I must oppose this bill. We cannot afford to give short shrift to basic priorities traditionally funded in this bill. It is my hope that after the President vetoes this bill, we produce a bipartisan foreign operations budget that can be supported by all.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Foreign Operations Conference Report and to express my disappointment that in passing this report the Committee has not provided funding for the U.S. commitment to the Wye River agreement.

This conference agreement, which provides \$12.6 billion in funding, is nearly \$2 billion below the President's request and \$1 billion less than last year's bill. This low level of funding makes it all but impossible for the U.S. to maintain its leadership role in the international community. Indeed, nearly every major account in the conference report is underfunded, including funding for voluntary international peacekeeping, the Peace Corps, Multilateral Development Banks, the Enhanced Threat Reduction Initiative, African development loan initiatives, the Global Environment Facility, and debt relief for the world's poorest countries.

Most troubling, one specific initiative, the Wye assistance for the Middle East peace process, is nonexistent.

As Israel and the Palestinian Authority move ahead with implementation of the Wye agreement and final status negotiations, it is vital that the United States also do its part in meeting its commitments and obligations.

On Monday I, and twenty-one of my colleagues, sent letters to the President and to the Majority and Minority leaders about the critical importance of meeting our Wye commitments. Let me tell you why I consider this to be such an important issue.

On September 4, 1999 Prime Minister Barak and Palestinian Authority President Arafat signed the Sharm el-Sheikh Memorandum, expediting the fulfillment of Israeli and Palestinian obligations under prior treaties, particularly the Wye agreement, and establishing a time line for the completion of final status negotiations by

September 13, 2000. Under this agreement: Israel has now relinquished an additional 7 percent of the West Bank, with 5 percent more slated for turnover to the Palestinian Authority later this year; Israel has released 199 Palestinian prisoners with another 150 scheduled for release later this year; Israel has started to open the Shuhada Road in Hebron; the Palestinian Authority has submitted its list of police; and, Israel and the Palestinian Authority have formally initiated final status negotiations.

Israel and the Palestinian Authority are meeting their obligations, and as Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinian Authority continue to make progress in these negotiations, it is all the more critical for the United States to provide the financial assistance and support that has been promised.

Whereas the first land transfer from Israel to the Palestinian Authority did not involve the movement of Israeli troops or bases, the next two planned transfers will involve the redeployment of troops, bases, and other infrastructure at considerable cost to Israel. In fact, there is some concern in Israel that if the U.S. is unable or unwilling to meet its commitments under Wye, the budget of the government of Israel will be thrown into chaos.

The United States has pledged to provide \$1.2 billion to Israel, \$400 million to the Palestinians, and \$300 million to Jordan to assist them in meeting their obligations under the Wye accord, as well as for economic assistance for Jordan and areas under the Palestinian Authority.

The United States has a deep commitment to Israel and its Arab partners in the peace process to help advance negotiations and to help meet the financial burden placed on the parties in the peace process in meeting their obligations. We have undertaken this commitment both because it is the right thing to do and because it serves well vital U.S. national security interests.

The Wye agreement represents an important step on the road to peace in the Middle East. We must meet our obligations under Wye, and I do not believe that Congress should pass a Foreign Operations Appropriations bill that does not include such funding.

I do not believe that the United States can adequately pursue our national interests and foreign affairs priorities with this Conference Report. It will not allow the U.S. to continue to operate important international programs at current levels, will undoubtedly detract from the stature of the U.S. in the international community, and lets down our partners in the Middle East peace process. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to this conference report.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, I have always supported the subcommittee's bill here on the Senate floor. We always

have difficult and controversial choices before our subcommittee. Under the leadership of Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY, we have been able to do a reasonable job crafting a bill with bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, that is not the case this year. I will be voting against the foreign operations appropriations measure. I take this action for a number of reasons.

Most importantly, this bill is woefully underfunded. The bill is \$2 billion less than President Clinton's request and some \$800 million below last year's congressionally approved funding level. This account has already been cut significantly in recent years. The most recent cuts, in my estimation, will cripple our already meager foreign aid efforts. We spend a great deal of time here in the Congress talking about the U.S. role as the world's lone superpower. The foreign operations bill is a test of our sincerity in providing global leadership beyond the realm of U.S. military might.

This bill does so many things that project an America to the world that we can and should all be proud of. We educate young girls, we provide micro-credit loans to small family enterprises, we export democracy throughout the world, we cooperate with human rights activists and monitors, and we create opportunities for American citizens and business interests abroad. Unfortunately, the bill on the floor today cripples our efforts to work internationally, vital work that is in the national interest of the United States.

The foreign operations bill fails to provide any funding to the important Middle East peace process. The President had requested \$500 million in assistance to aid the implementation of the Wye River Accords. This small investment in peace and security is even more important given the recent agreement between Israel's new government and the Palestinian Authority. Now is the time to reassert U.S. support for the peace process that, at this moment, shows so much hope and promise.

I also am disappointed that this bill underfunds our export promotion programs. For example, the Export-Import Bank, which protects and creates American jobs, is funded below the 1999 level and far below the Administration's 2000 request. U.S. workers compete in the global economy. That's a fact. It is equally true that other governments in Asia and Europe do far more to help their exporters succeed. Our ability to compete and win abroad for American workers is impacted by the foreign operations bill. And this bill could do far more for American workers.

Finally, I continue to have reservations regarding the funding levels and the restrictive language placed on our international family planning assistance programs. The restrictive language is particularly harmful as it cripples the provision of valuable fam-

ily planning programs which aid population control, economic development, environmental protection and some many other areas. Our false family planning debates driven by domestic politics here in the United States only harm thousands of women and families in the developing world.

Mr. President, this bill will not become law. President Clinton has promised a veto for numerous, very legitimate reasons. I encourage the President to follow through with a veto if this bill makes it to his desk. And I am anxious to work with my Senate colleagues on a new version of this bill. This is an important bill. Given the resources, I am confident that Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY can deliver a bill the Senate will again endorse with wide bipartisan margins.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I have to say that I am disappointed in the foreign operations appropriations conference report. In my estimation then, and in my estimation now, this bill has two huge flaws: First of all, the bill as a whole is under funded. It simply does not dedicate the necessary monies for our nation's foreign operations.

The Administration has indicated that the President will veto this bill, and I approve that decision. The amount in this bill is nearly \$2 billion less than the administration's request. That is unacceptable.

The second major problem is that, not only is overall funding inadequate, two essential programs have either faced draconian cuts, or have not been funded at all. It is on those programs that I wish to speak.

Perhaps the biggest failure of this bill is that it does not provide the amount that the President requested to support the Middle East Wye River Agreement.

I find it irresponsible that the conference report does not include a single penny to fulfill our commitment to support the agreement. Early in September, Israel and the Palestinian Authority signed an agreement to carry out Wye and to move to final status negotiations.

Just as the peace process is getting back on track, this conference report sends a signal of American retreat from our historic moral and strategic commitments in the Middle East.

The \$800 billion in aid missing from the conference report for fiscal years 1999, and the \$500 missing from this year's appropriation were requested to support Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinian Authority in critical areas.

In Israel, funds were requested to assist Israel in carrying out its military re-deployments and to acquire anti-terrorism equipment. In the Palestinian Authority, support was requested for education, health care, and basic infrastructure in order to reduce the influence of radical groups that thrive off of economic misery.

In Jordan, support is needed to bolster the new King as he takes bold and risky moves to support peace and aggressively fight terror.

The parties in the region will need to know that we are a reliable partner as they move to the most contentious issues in the peace process. This conference report calls into question our ability to carry out our commitments.

The second failure of this year's conference report is that it does not fund the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative, an essential part of U.S. efforts to reduce the chances for the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction from the former Soviet Union.

Almost every one of the Department of State budget increases proposed in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative has been zeroed out in the conference report. This occurred despite the inclusion in the Senate bill of two floor amendments calling for the conferees to achieve full funding of these program requests. I regret that this message was ignored by the conferees, and frankly I fear that their action could endanger our national security.

Some of the programs that are unfunded in this bill were to help Russia's biological weapons experts find new fields of work. If we fail to do that, these very same experts could later threaten our crops, our livestock, and our very lives.

Assistance for the Newly Independent States was decreased by 445 million from a Senate passed level that was already \$250 million below the Administration's request. While it is unclear where the additional cut would be made, it could reduce existing non-proliferation assistance programs such as the International Science and Technology Centers in Russia and Ukraine. Through these centers over 24,000 former weapons scientists have found jobs in places other than nuclear and biological weapons labs in Iraq and Iran.

The same could be said for the Civilian Research and Development Fund. This foundation provides training for Russians who are former weapons scientist so that they can embark in non-military careers. Not only the United States, but the entire world has benefited from this.

I accept the fact that Congress has to make some tough choices in all of our appropriations. There are literally a dozen more programs in this bill that I would like to see increased funding for. We cannot designate as much money as we would like in all the areas we would like. However, I believe that the programs I have outlined above are crucial to the effective execution of United States foreign policy.

By ignoring them, we are creating serious problems which may very well be costly to correct. Diplomacy and assistance are cheap compared to the price we pay when they fail. When the Senate passed its appropriation bill in June, I hoped that these flaws I have just discussed would be corrected. They were not. As it stands, I cannot support the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, the foreign operations con-

ference report includes a major concession to the Clinton administration—it strikes language which attempted to stop U.S. taxpayer dollars from being used to promote abortion abroad, imposing an imperialistic, left-wing, pro-death agenda on the nearly 100 countries who have, for deeply-held religious reasons, upheld the sanctity of human life and who believe that life, including lives of the innocent and unborn, are sacred in God's eyes.

Regrettably, the House-passed language, the Smith-Barcia Foreign Families Protection amendment, while not cutting funding for the international population assistance, would have at least restored the prohibition on using these funds to support foreign organizations that lobby to repeal or undermine the laws of foreign governments against abortion. Since the Senate refused to negotiate with the House on a proposed compromise on the issue, as a result, the conference report on foreign operations has no pro-life safeguards. The Senate conferees did not accept the House's proposal to reinstate last year's ban on funding for the U.N. Population Fund in exchange for dropping the Foreign Families Protection Act Amendment.

The UNFPA has cooperated with the Peoples Republic of China in implementing coercive population control including forced abortion and sterilization. There are examples of poor people around the world being coerced into sterilization and fertility experimentation, sometimes, as was reported in Peru, by the threat of withholding food aid.

More recently, in Kosovo, Concerned Women for America reported that while refugees sought water, clothing and other basic necessities, the UNFPA and Planned Parenthood delivered what they considered "life-saving supplies"—working with the UNHCR, they dispatched "emergency reproductive health kits" for about 350,000 people for a period of 3 to 6 months.

These kits included oral and injectable contraception kits, sexually transmitted disease kits, intrauterine device (IUDs) kits, complications of abortion kits, vacuum extraction equipment and, condoms (UNFPA press release, 4/8/99).

The U.S. State Department estimates that of the 350,000 refugees, 10 percent are either pregnant, breastfeeding or caring for very young infants. Also, Kosovo has one of the two highest total fertility rates in Europe, making it a prime target for population controllers like UNFPA (Planned Parenthood press release, 4/13/99).

UNFPA and Planned Parenthood are putting these women at risk. CWA found a doctor with 10 years experience with the UNHCR, as well as numerous non-governmental organizations (NGOs), who was willing to testify without attribution about the danger of providing birth control pills and emergency "contraception" to refugee women. This doctor worked extensively

within the U.N. and externally to prevent distribution of emergency "contraception" which causes chemical abortion in the early stages of pregnancy and manual vacuum aspirators used to perform abortions.

The doctor confirmed the fact that refugee women who use birth control pills are vulnerable in two specific ways. First, they do not receive information to make an informed decision, nor are they guaranteed a doctor's continuing care.

Vacuum aspirators included in the UNFPA kit are particularly dangerous. These manual devices cannot be sterilized, risking fatal infections, and can puncture the uterus. Rather than life-saving, these devices can be life-threatening.

The UNFPA and PPFA are exploiting these desperate, vulnerable refugee women. They are attempting to indoctrinate them with the U.N.'s radical notions about sexuality and abortion. Abortions may only intensify their physical and emotional distress. Post-abortion syndrome (PAS) is a type of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, once believed only to affect war veterans.

This year, unsuccessfully, an effort was made in the House to transfer funds from "international family planning" programs to child survival programs—this is based on the pleas of many respected people in the children's health field, including health ministers in Africa, who have begged the West for basic medicines like penicillin and rehydration salts. They have said their shelves are overflowing with condoms, while they watch their infants and young children die from basic maladies that would never go untreated in the industrialized world. Their calls have gone unheeded. The Clinton Administration's foreign policy priority is to ensure that women can abort their babies, not to ensure that mothers who give birth can properly care for their children.

The fight is not over—the issue of protecting women and their unborn children and of respecting the pro-life, pro-family laws of foreign nations will resurface this year.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President: I rise in opposition to the adoption of H.R. 2606—the fiscal year 2000 foreign operations conference report.

Let me say at the outset that it is very unusual for me to oppose an appropriations bill of this kind, but I do so today because I believe that if it becomes law it will jeopardize United States interests globally. Why are our interests threatened? They are threatened because this bill does not provide the wherewithal to the Clinton administration so that it can effectively carry out United States foreign policies and programs. Many programs being funded by this bill are at drastically reduced levels. The total dollar value of the appropriations contained in this conference report are approximately \$2 billion below levels requested by the President.

The conferees apparently did not think that the Middle Peace Process is of critical interest to the United States because nowhere can a find funding in support of the implementation of the Wye Agreement—clearly a critical component in ensuring that the peace process move forward. I believe that this omission is extremely unwise and is reason enough alone for Members of this body to oppose it.

But that is not the only problem with this bill. Let me discuss some of the other deficiencies as well.

First, Mr. President, we all know how much bipartisan support the Peace Corps engenders in both Houses of Congress. Peace Corps volunteers are our "citizen diplomats" abroad. The lasting good will and friendship that results from American men and women serving as volunteers for two years in countries that need and want their presence is immeasurable. No one that I know of has any complaints about the organization. Yet, this bill would short change its fiscal year 2000 budget by \$35 million, making it nearly impossible for the Peace Corps to meet its congressionally mandated goal of placing 10,000 volunteers in the field early in the next decade.

Nor does this conference report contain a penny for use by the Clinton administration as its initial responses to the tragic natural disasters that have just occurred in Turkey and Taiwan. Surely we could have provided some start up monies to assist our friends in their hour of need. Similarly, money was not included in this bill to assist the people of Kosovo begin the painful process of rebuilding after the devastation wrought by Serbian forces earlier this year.

The phrase "penny wise and pound foolish" comes readily to mind as one reviews the provisions of this bill. Let me highlight some of the most important deficiencies as I see them: \$175 million reduction in loan programs designed to help the poorest nations address their critical needs; \$157 million reduction in global environmental protection programs; \$26 million below the Senate passed appropriated amounts for the U.S. Export Import Bank and additional unnecessary Congressional notification requirements that could delay approval of export credit applications; \$85 million reduction in debt relief for the poorest countries; \$200 million reduction in regional democracy building and economic development programs for Africa, Latin America and Asia; \$297 million reduction in democracy and civil society programs in the independent states of the former Soviet Union; and \$20 million reduction in funds to support the Korean Peninsula Development Organization and seriously restrictive legislative conditions which jeopardize important ongoing U.S. diplomatic efforts to contain the North Korean nuclear threat to the Korean Peninsula.

This is certainly not an exhaustive listing of all the problems I have with

this bill, but merely the highlights, or low lights as the case may be, of the serious inadequacies with the foreign operations conference report. Having said that I believe that the issues I have cited are more than enough reason for members to vote against this legislation and I urge them to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am sorry my friend and colleague, the Senator from Vermont, is not going to be able to support the bill. But I do want to commend him for his ongoing effort with regard to demining. The Leahy War Victims Fund has had a dramatic impact not only on rehabilitation but also on safety; in addition, Senator LEAHY's interest in and devotion to the subject of infectious diseases. He has single-handedly driven the funding levels up. The surveillance, control, and treatment have improved throughout the world because of his commitment.

I commend him for that.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that both sides are interested in having this vote at noon. I am prepared to yield back my time, if Senator LEAHY is, and we will proceed with the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my understanding is that no one else on this side wishes to speak.

In that case, I yield our time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded.

The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 312 Leg.]

#### YEAS—51

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Allard	Fitzgerald	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Brownback	Grams	Roberts
Bunning	Grassley	Roth
Burns	Gregg	Santorum
Campbell	Hatch	Sessions
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchinson	Snowe
Collins	Hutchison	Specter
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Jeffords	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner

#### NAYS—49

Akaka	Bingaman	Byrd
Baucus	Boxer	Cleland
Bayh	Breaux	Conrad
Biden	Bryan	Daschle

Dodd	Kerrey	Reid
Dorgan	Kerry	Robb
Durbin	Kohl	Rockefeller
Edwards	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Feingold	Lautenberg	Schumer
Feinstein	Leahy	Smith (NH)
Graham	Levin	Smith (OR)
Hagel	Lieberman	Torricelli
Harkin	Lincoln	Voinovich
Hollings	Mikulski	Wellstone
Inouye	Moynihan	Wyden
Johnson	Murray	
Kennedy	Reed	

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BENNETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1889

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1889 to amendment No. 1851. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 313 Leg.]

#### YEAS—54

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Roth
Brownback	Grassley	Santorum
Bunning	Gregg	Sessions
Burns	Hagel	Shelby
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Helms	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Snowe
Collins	Hutchison	Specter
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Jeffords	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Voinovich
Enzi	Mack	Warner

#### NAYS—46

Akaka	Feingold	Lincoln
Baucus	Feinstein	McCain
Bayh	Graham	Mikulski
Biden	Harkin	Moynihan
Bingaman	Hollings	Murray
Boxer	Inouye	Reed
Breaux	Johnson	Reid
Bryan	Kennedy	Robb
Byrd	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kohl	Schumer
Daschle	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden
Durbin	Levin	
Edwards	Lieberman	

The amendment (No. 1889) was agreed to.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next order of business be 9 minutes for the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS. I